

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

In re Z.B., A Person Coming
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN
AND FAMILY SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

M.B.,

Defendant and Appellant.

B288970

Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. DK24496B

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of
Los Angeles County. Stephen C. Marpet, Juvenile Court Referee.
Dismissed.

Christopher R. Booth, under appointment by the Court
of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel, Kristine P. Miles,
Assistant County Counsel, and Stephanie Jo Reagan, Principal
Deputy County Counsel, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

M.B. (father) appealed from the juvenile court's disposition order requiring father to attend domestic violence and anger management classes.¹ In February 2018, the juvenile court sustained a petition alleging dependency jurisdiction over father's daughter Z.B. The court's disposition order released Z.B. to home of parents and ordered father to participate in the following programs: (1) individual counseling to address case-related issues, including domestic violence and co-parenting; (2) parenting; and (3) anger management (through a 52-week session).

On May 27, 2019, after this appeal was submitted but still pending, father requested we take judicial notice of the juvenile court's (1) April 26, 2019 custody order granting joint legal and physical custody of Z.B. to her parents, with primary residence to Z.B.'s mother, and unlimited visitation for father, and (2) April 26, 2019 minute order terminating its jurisdiction over Z.B. We deemed father's request filed as of May 29, 2019, granted it on May 31, 2019, and requested briefing on whether we should dismiss this appeal as moot. Respondent argued the appeal should be dismissed; father submitted the issue to the court.

The order terminating jurisdiction renders father's appeal from the disposition order moot because there is no more effective relief that this court could grant father from the disposition order. (See *In re Anna S.* (2010) 180 Cal.App.4th 1489, 1498 [a case is moot when it is "impossible for the appellate court to grant the appellant effective relief"].) Reversal of the order

¹ Based on our review of the record, the juvenile court did not order father to participate in a domestic violence batterer's treatment program as father argued on appeal.

requiring father to complete a 52-week anger management class also would have no impact on any subsequent family law proceedings, as completion of the class is not a basis for modification of the juvenile court's custody order. (*In re M.C.* (2011) 199 Cal.App.4th 784, 802 [reviewing court decides “ ‘[o]n a case-by case basis’ ” if subsequent events have rendered appeal moot “ ‘and whether its decision would affect the outcome of the case in a subsequent proceeding’ ”].)

With the termination of the juvenile court's jurisdiction, the disposition order from which father has appealed no longer forms the basis for any ruling adverse to him. Because there is no effective relief we can provide father by way of this appeal, we dismiss the appeal. (*In re I.A.* (2011) 201 Cal.App.4th 1484, 1490.)

DISPOSITION

The appeal is dismissed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

EGERTON, J.

We concur:

EDMON, P.J.

LAVIN, J.